



SA Water Regulatory Business Proposal 2016-2020

## Attachment H Supply optimisation review, MWH (Executive Summary)

**Full report provided to ESCOSA** 



## FINAL REPORT RBP16 Supply Mix Optimisation Modelling Review

Prepared for SA Water April 2015

## **CONTENTS**

| EX | ECL  | JT۱  | /E SUMMARY   | . 4 |
|----|------|------|--|-----|
| 1  | Inti | rodı | uction   | . 5 |
| 1. | 1    | Sco  | ppe  | . 5 |
| 1. | 2    | Op   | timisation Approach  | . 7 |
| 1. | 3    | Мо   | del Robustness and Validation  | . 8 |
| 2  | Inp  | ut [ | Data Review (for Final Runs)   | . 9 |
| 2. | 1    | De   | mands  | . 9 |
|    | 2.1  | .1   | Demand Development   | 11  |
| 2. | 2    | Infl | ows  | 13  |
| 2. | 3    | Ele  | ctricity Tariffs   | 14  |
| 2. | 4    | Ade  | elaide Desalination Plant  | 14  |
| 2. | 5    | Eva  | aporation  | 15  |
| 2. | 6    | Sta  | rt Levels and Minimum/Maximum Storage Levels                                   | 15  |
| 2. | 7    | Wa   | ter Treatment Costs and Capacities   | 16  |
| 2. | 8    | En   | vironmental Flows  | 17  |
| 3  | Da   | ta ( | Changes, Assumptions and Constraints   | 18  |
| 3. | 1    | Ch   | anges to Input data and Impact on Results                                      | 18  |
|    | 3.1  | .1   | Demands  | 18  |
|    | 3.1  | .2   | Storages   | 18  |
|    | 3.1  | .3   | Flow Constraints   | 19  |
|    | 3.1  | .4   | ADP Production   | 21  |
| 4  | Fin  | al S | Solution Review  | 21  |
| 4. | 1    | Co   | mparison with Initial Solution   | 21  |
|    | 4.1  | .1   | Demand   | 21  |
|    | 4.1  | .2   | Starting Conditions and Storage Criteria                                       | 21  |
|    | 4.1  | .3   | Link Flow Criteria   | 21  |
|    | 4.1  | .4   | Pump Availability  | 22  |
|    | 4.1  | .5   | Interim and Final Solution Performance Comparison                              | 22  |
| 4. | 2    | Co   | mparison of Final Solution 1 <sup>st</sup> 2 years and 2 <sup>nd</sup> 2 years | 22  |
|    | 4.2  | .1   | Two x Two Year Approach  | 22  |
|    | 4.2  | .2   | Costs  | 23  |
|    | 4.2  | .3   | Water Treatment Plants   | 23  |
|    | 4.2  | .4   | Pumping Volumes  | 23  |
|    | 4.2  | .5   | Storages   | 24  |
| 4. | 3    | Sol  | ution Sensitivity  | 24  |
| 5  | Fin  | al S | Solution Details (2016/2017 – 2019/2020)                                       | 25  |
| 5. | 1    | Sol  | ution Summary  | 25  |
|    | 5.1  | .1   | Key Solution Features  | 26  |

| 5.   | 2 Wa            | ter Treatment Plant Production   | 26 |
|------|-----------------|--|----|
| 5.   | 3 Ma            | or Pumping and Transfer Pumping  | 28 |
| 5.   | 4 Bul           | k Water Network Transfers and Spill                                      | 29 |
| 5.   | 5 Sup           | oply to Metro Demands (DOT Zones)  | 32 |
|      | 5.5.1           | 103C Zone  | 32 |
|      | 5.5.2           | 103S Zone and 103L Zone  | 33 |
|      | 5.5.3           | 170S Zone  | 34 |
|      | 5.5.4           | 170C Zone  | 35 |
|      | 5.5.5           | 170N Zone, AHN and AHS Zones   | 35 |
|      | 5.5.6           | 51S Zone   | 36 |
|      | 5.5.7           | 51N Zone   | 37 |
|      | 5.5.8           | LP Zone, BS Zone and BAR Zone  | 38 |
| 5.   | 6 Sto           | rages  | 39 |
|      | 5.6.1           | Torrens System: Millbrook, Kangaroo Creek, Hope Valley, Little Para      | 39 |
|      | 5.6.2           | South Parra System: Warren, South Para, Barossa                          | 41 |
|      | 5.6.3           | Onkaparinga System: Mount Bold, Happy Valley                             | 43 |
|      | 5.6.4           | Myponga System: Myponga  |    |
| 6    | Conclu          | isions   | 45 |
| 7    | Recon           | nmendations  | 45 |
| Apı  | oendix <i>i</i> | A: Demand Forecasts  | 46 |
| Apı  | oendix l        | 3: Inflows   | 49 |
|      |                 | C: Electricity Tariffs   |    |
| Apı  | oendix l        | D: Storage Criteria  | 51 |
| Apı  | oendix I        | E: Environmental Flows   | 52 |
|      |                 | F: Solution Cost, Energy, Volume Summary                                 |    |
| Apı  | oendix (        | G: DOT Zone Layout (metro demands)                                       | 55 |
| LIS  | от О            | TABLES   |    |
| Tab  | le 1 –C         | ountry and Metro Demands per Month                                       | 11 |
| Tab  | le 2 – E        | vaporation Rates (mm/ha/day)   | 15 |
| Tab  | le 3 – V        | Vater Treatment Costs (\$/ML)  | 16 |
| Tab  | le 4 – V        | Vater Treatment Minimum and Maximum Flow Capacities (ML/d)               | 16 |
| Tab  | le 5 - E        | nvironmental Flow Rates per Month (ML/d)                                 | 17 |
| Tab  | le 6 – F        | inal Solution Cost Breakdown   | 25 |
| LIS  | эт оғ           | FIGURES  |    |
| Figu | ure 1 –         | DOT Model Layout with GIS background of Demand Zones and Catchment Areas | 6  |
| Figu | ıre 2 –         | Country Land Demand Input Data (ML/d)                                    | 9  |
| Figu | ıre 3 –         | Total Country Demand Volumes (ML) per timestep (week)                    | 9  |

| Figure 4 – Metro Demand Input Data (ML/d)  | 0  |
|--|----|
| Figure 5 – Total Metro Demand Volumes (ML) per timestep (week)   | 0  |
| Figure 6 – Annual Inflow Input Data (ML/d)   | 3  |
| Figure 7 – Annual Inflow Volumes (ML) per timestep (week)  | 3  |
| Figure 8 – ADP Volume Produced (ML) per week   | 4  |
| Figure 9 – Total Environmental Flow Volumes (ML)   | 7  |
| Figure 10 – Water Treatment Plant Weekly Average Flow Rates (ML/d)                                       | 7  |
| Figure 11 - Major Pumping and Transfer Pumping Annual Average and Yearly Volumes 2                       | 8  |
| Figure 12 – MBO and MAPL weekly average flow rates 2016/2017- 2019/2020 2                                | 8: |
| Figure 13 – Pumped Supply to Anstey Hill Water Treatment Plant   | 9  |
| Figure 14 – Pumped Supply to Little Para Reservoir   | 9  |
| Figure 15 – Transfers into Kangaroo Creek Reservoir  | 0  |
| Figure 16 – Gorge Weir Environmental Flows, Spills and Transfers from Kangaroo Creek                     | 0  |
| Figure 17 - Warren and Swan Reach Transfer Flows to South Para   | 1  |
| Figure 18 - Clarendon Weir Environmental Flows, Spills and Transfers from Mt Bold 3                      | 1  |
| Figure 19 – Supply Mix to the 103C DOT Zone  | 2  |
| Figure 20 – Supply Mix to the 103L DOT Zone  | 3  |
| Figure 21 – Eastern Transfers (PP_Wattle Park) or Non-Transfer Nth $\rightarrow$ Sth (P_170C.WattlePk) 3 | 4  |
| Figure 22 – Supply Mix to the 170S DOT Zone  | 4  |
| Figure 23 – Supply Mix to the 170C DOT Zone  | 5  |
| Figure 24 – Supply Mix to the 170N DOT Zone  | 6  |
| Figure 25 – Supply Mix to the 51S DOT Zone   | 6  |
| Figure 26 – Supply Mix to the 51N DOT Zone   | 7  |
| Figure 27 - Supply Mix to the LP DOT Zone (transfers, Little Para WTP, Barossa WTP) 3                    | 8  |
| Figure 28 - Supply Mix to the BS DOT Zone (transfers, Little Para WTP, Barossa WTP) 3                    | 9  |
| Figure 29 -Millbrook, Kangaroo Creek, Hope Valley and Little Para Storage Performance 4                  | 0  |
| Figure 30 - Warren, South Para and Barossa Storage Performance   | 2  |
| Figure 31 – Mount Bold, Happy Valley and Myponga Storage Performance 4                                   | 4  |

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

SA Water is required to develop a forecast operating plan for the upcoming regulatory period 2016/2017 – 2019/2020. This forecast plan provides input to budget forecasting, water supply security forecasting and operations management forecasting. To develop the operating plan, the Operations Control Group (OCG) have used the Distribution Optimisation Tool (DOT) which was designed and developed for SA Water in 2013/2014.

The optimisation tool is a mass balance model of the Adelaide network, taking into account water supply from the River Murray, bulk water reservoir storages, transmission mains and rivers, metropolitan water treatment plants and the metropolitan distribution network. The DOT uses a very large LP (linear program) with appropriate pre-processing of non-linear hydraulic relationships. DOT has a long term and a short term module that can be used for optimising different problems. The long term module runs with a weekly time step over a 2 year horizon and this was used to develop the operating plan for RBP16. Two optimisation sessions were run back-to- back to cover the 4 year period required for the operating plan.

The purpose of this report is to review the final solution (RBP16 Operating Plan) developed by SA Water. MWH was contracted in 2014 to assist in the setup and initial optimisation runs for the RBP16 plan. SA Water has now updated the optimisation model (new input data, constraints, etc) and developed a final solution and engaged MWH to review the final solution. The input data used in the final runs has been reviewed and provided in this report and the final solution has also been compared with the interim solutions developed in 2014 as part of checking the solution performance.

The final solution developed by SA Water correctly applied updated input data provided by a number of stakeholders within SA Water. Changes made to some of the constraints in the model (such as maximum flow) all were appropriate and drew on trends seen in the interim solutions, but applied more practical operating rules. These were all beneficial changes and allowed a balance between optimised solution costs and a solution that is not too difficult to operate in the field. Some of the key solution features include:

- There is no Excess Spill in the final solution
- There is flow from Millbrook to Kangaroo Creek via the dissipater at times
- There is flow from Mannum Adelaide pipeline to Little Para reservoir at times
- Anstey Hill Water Treatment Plant (WTP) receives water from both Mannum Adelaide pipeline and Millbrook reservoir, but not at the same time due to the constraints set in the model
- Little Para WTPis offline 3 months of the year, Hope Valley WTP is online at all times
- . There is no pumping from Mannum Adelaide pipeline to Warren reservoir at all times
- The Northern and Western Transfers are used frequently in the metro network
- The Central transfer is not used and Eastern Transfer is only partial (no flow into Terminal Storage)
- Morgan-Whyalla pipeline operating cost is excluded from DOT modelling

The solution costs over each 12 month period of the 4 years are similar. As demands increase slightly and different electricity tariffs have been used across the years, some differences in costs are expected. The pumping strategy, the levels in the reservoirs and the mix of supply from the water treatment plants to the metro area are quite similar year to year.

| Year  | 2016/2017 | 2017/2018 | 2018/2019 | 2019/2020 |  |  |  |  |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|--|--|--|
| Major Pumping Energy Cost (\$) (excl.Morgan-Whyalla pipeline) |           |           |           |           |  |  |  |  |
| Total   |           |           |           |           |  |  |  |  |
| Metro Pumping Energy Cost (\$)                                |           |           |           |           |  |  |  |  |
| Total   |           |           |           |           |  |  |  |  |
| Treatment Cost (\$) (incl. Swan Reach and Morgan WTPs)        |           |           |           |           |  |  |  |  |
| Total   |           |           |           |           |  |  |  |  |
| Total cost excluding min-hydro revenue (\$)                   |           |           |           |           |  |  |  |  |
| Pumping+WTP   |           |           |           |           |  |  |  |  |